DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 425 AC 010 450

AUTHOR Given, C. William; Mitchell, John B.
TITLE A Community Power Structure: A Methodological Analysis and Comparison.
INSTITUTION Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Wooster.
REPORT NO R-Bull-1046
PUB DATE Jun 71
NOTE 20p.; Part of Hatch Project 304 "A Study of the Decision-Making Process in Small Communities"

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Community Leaders, *Power Structure, *Research Methodology, *Rural Areas, *Social Systems
IDENTIFIERS Hatch Project 304

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to analyze and compare the structure of influence in two rural communities in southern Ohio with population centers of less than 10,000 inhabitants. (For a study of one of the communities only, see AC 010 451.) The two communities are studied as to reputed influentials, the business and economic subsystem, the civic organizational subsystem, the educational subsystem, and the governmental subsystem. A comparison of the two communities as to influence structure revealed both similarities and differences. One community, Riverview (a pseudonym) had a structure of influence directed by community influentials; in the other community, Newton (a pseudonym), the reputed community influentials, with one exception, seemed neither to be the source of influence nor closely allied to influential units of the community. Conclusions are that: (1) the reputational technique makes it difficult to locate and identify socially and geographically removed individuals, emerging influentials, and influentials no longer active in community decision making; (2) the social system as a conceptual tool is useful as a theoretical framework from which to analyze the structure of influence; (3) the vertical system concept is a useful tool in analyzing extra-community based influence; and (4) the two communities exhibit characteristics similar to larger ones. (DB)

ED052425

RESEARCH BULLETIN 1046

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JUNE 1971

Community Power Structure: A Methodological Analysis and Comparison

C. WILLIAM GIVEN

JOHN B. MITCHELL

OHIO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
Wooster, Ohio

AA001450

CONTENTS

Introduction 3
Objectives of the Study 4
Theoretical Considerations 4
The Social System 4
The Vertical System Concept 4
Social Power 4
Influence Structure 5
Methodology 5
Selection of Judges and Nomination of Influentials 5
Designation of Community Influentials 5
The Subsystem Analysis 5
Background of Communities 6
The Riverview Community 6
Reputed Influentials 6
The Business and Economic Subsystem 7
The Civic Organizational Subsystem 7
The Educational Subsystem 8
The Governmental Subsystem 8
Summary of Findings 9
The Newtown Community 9
Reputed Influentials 9
The Business and Economic Subsystem 10
The Civic Organizational Subsystem 11
The Educational Subsystem 12
The Governmental Subsystem 13
Summary of Findings 13
A Comparison of the Riverview and Newtown Structures of Influence 14
Summary and Conclusions 15
Comments on the Reputational Method of Studying Community Power 15
A Comparison of Findings in Other Studies 16
Bibliography 17
Appendix A 18
Appendix B 19
Appendix C 19
Appendix D 19

AGDEX 885 6-71 3M

Community Power Structure: A Methodological Analysis and Comparison[1]

C. WILLIAM GIVEN and JOHN B. MITCHELL[2]

INTRODUCTION

The community has long been one of the most investigated units of society. The rapid growth of government self-help programs has created a greater awareness on the part of local change agents of the importance of the structure of social power at the community level. In many instances, these agents became aware of social power when projects which they initiated began to meet resistance from community members. Decision-making and community change almost without exception involve key power figures in the local community.

Research on community power structures has largely focused on the larger urban communities. Small rural communities have received less attention than the more urbanized areas. This poses a question: How well do the generalizations, based on researching larger communities, agree with social reality as it exists in smaller rural communities?

More important from the research standpoint are the questions dealing with methodology, comparison, and conceptualization. This study attempts to answer these questions at least in part.

Analyses of community power structures have received considerable attention from sociologists since the publication of Community Power Structures (15). Floyd Hunter popularized the community as a source of inquiry. His methodological techniques greatly facilitated the study of community power. Since the original acceptance of this book, many sociologists and political scientists have questioned his reputational technique for delineating community leaders and decision-makers.

Danzger (9) has recorded more than 559 studies of community power structure in the literature. However, he notes that there still exists much disagreement about the nature of power at the community level.

Despite this prolific output of research, many other questions have gone unanswered. Bell, Hill, and Wright(3), in their book Public Leadership, point to several areas for further research. One of the areas is concerned with comparative studies. "With few exceptions most of the analyses of community leaders have not been comparative in nature. Rather, most of them are case studies of a particular community, state, or nation" (3, p. 32). Delbert C. Miller has completed research on an English and American community (17). After an extensive review of the literature, the authors found one study which compared two communities within one geographically similar area (22).

Most of the research to date has dealt with larger urban industrialized communities. Some researchers, however, have considered the small community. Presthus, Vidich and Bensman, and Bohlen have all done studies in small rural communities.[3] Each of these studies reports a coalition of a small number of influentials who have control over many areas of community life (19). Only one of these studies was of a comparative nature. Presthus sought to examine the dimensions of power in two small rural communities. His uni-dimensional structure of power would correspond to a monolithic power structure, just as his multi-dimensional structure would correspond to a pluralistic power structure (22).

Another problem which has received little research attention is stated by another community sociologist, Warren, in his book The Community in America (27). He sets forth a series of what he terms great changes in American communities. One is the rising influence of locally based organizations which have a closer relationship with their national headquarters than with the local community. Warren analyzes this problem in terms of a community member holding a particular position within such an organization. "In occupying a status (position) in one of the local units of such a system he must be guided by role expectations from that extra-community system" (27, p. 65).

Warren, in the above statement, describes how the extra-community system can command the loyalty of the community member. He specifies the problem for the community. "Obviously, to the extent

[1]This study is part of Hatch Project 304, A Study of the Decision-Making Process in Small Communities, being conducted in the Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center.

[2]Assistant Professor, Office of Health Services Education and Research, College of Human Medicine, Michigan State University, and Professor of Rural Sociology, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and The Ohio State University. Dr. Given was formerly a research assistant in the Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, OARDC and OSU.

[3]For a review of 33 studies involving 55 communities, see Walton, John, Jan. 1966. Substance and Artifact: The Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure. Amer. J. Sociol., 71 (4): 430-438.

that decision-making is transferred elsewhere, it impairs community autonomy. In many instances, of course, the goals for which the unit works are simply not appropriate to the community levels" (27, p. 65). While the problem of decision-making and community autonomy is present in many communities, it has not received sufficient research attention to be thoroughly clarified.

Objectives of the Study

In view of the areas which have not been adequately researched, this study attempts to:

- Analyze the structure of power in two communities in order to understand the scopes of power held by reputed influentials.
- Examine the sources of influence to understand the relationships of community based power and extra-community based power.
- Determine the possible interaction among power holders in making decisions which affect community life.
- Determine what features of comparability exist in the power structures of two small rural communities.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Social System

This study was undertaken using the social system model as the conceptual tool for the analysis. It was decided to use Loomis' model (16) for this study as he has delineated elements common to all systems.

The social system as Loomis defines it (16, p. 4) is "composed of the patterned interaction of members. It is constituted of the interaction of a plurality of individual actors whose relations to each other are mutually oriented through the definition and mediation of a pattern of structured and shared symbols and expectations." From this definitive perspective, Loomis moves to the analytic aspects of interaction—the elements—which he uses to analyze the structure of any social system. These elements are: 1) belief (knowledge), 2) sentiment, 3) end goal or objective, 4) norm, 5) status role (position), 6) rank, 7) power, 8) sanction, and 9) facility. Loomis then considers the processes which: "mesh, stabilize, and alter the relations between the elements through time, they are the tools through which the social system may be understood as a dynamic functioning continuity" (16, pp. 5-6).

Loomis then combines these basic elements into six master processes which can be used to analyze group behavior within the social system framework. Each master process includes one or several of the basic elements or processes. These master processes are: 1) communication, 2) boundary maintenance, 3) systemic linkage, 4) socialization, 5) social control, and 6) institutionalization. The two master processes used in this study were systemic linkage and boundary maintenance.

Boundary maintenance is a process which insures that the identity of the social system is preserved and the interaction pattern characteristic of the individual system maintained. Boundary maintenance as a process becomes operative when the social system is threatened. Specific elements available to system members interested in increasing boundary maintenance activities are: power, goals, rank, and sanctions. Boundary maintenance tends to increase integration and solidarity of the system, making it distinct from other systems and insuring its continuance.

Systemic linkage represents the reverse process of boundary maintenance. Systemic linkage provides for the interaction and integration of two or more systems. This is accomplished through the articulation of one or more elements in such a manner that on certain occasions or at certain times the two systems may be viewed as a single system.

The Vertical System Concept

In his penetrating analysis of community, Roland Warren defines and discusses a community's vertical pattern "as the structural and functional relation of its various social units and subsystems as to extra-community systems" (27, p. 161). Examples of specific vertical systems constituting the vertical pattern are branch plants of large absentee-owned corporations and community health organizations which are local units of national health systems.

This concept was employed to determine if small communities were affected by the vertical systems with units located within their community boundaries. In this study, a vertical system is defined as one *located or represented in the community, but having its point of origin or "headquarters" outside of the community.*

Social Power

The concept of social power has been the focal point of a long-standing debate within sociological and philosophical circles. The debate has centered about the conceptualization of power as authority—the right of a specific position—versus power in its informal aspects which includes coercion and voluntary influence.

This study did not concern itself with delineating the types of power utilized by influentials. The general term influence was used in this study to include both formal power, which accompanies a status-role position, and informal power, which could include coercion or evolve as a product of a social relationship.

Influence was operationally defined as *the capacity to alter the course of events in a manner which*

they otherwise would not have been, through the use of a position, a reputation, or through factors related to the specific social relationships. It is the authors' opinion that influence is a combination of these factors, one of which may be dominant, but all of which are active in the course of influencing specific events.

Influence Structure

This bulletin deals with a description and analysis of the structure of influence in two communities. The concept of social power has been operationally defined as influence, so that the various formal and informal aspects of the concept might be included in the analysis.

The concept of influence structure must be defined in order to delineate it from the larger and more inclusive concept of social structure. Loomis views the social system as having social structure (16). Social structure[4] within a system can be determined by observing the patterning and ordering of the interaction based on the elements of the system. The influence structure is the ordering and patterning of the interaction within a system based on the element power (influence) and all other elements as they relate to the use of influence within the social system.

Hypothesis: Reputed community influentials will exert influence in four selected subsystems of the community.

This hypothesis was designed to test the validity of the reputational technique, and in so doing to increase understanding of the relationship between community based and extra-community based power while examining the nature of the structures of power.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in gathering the data for this study closely paralleled the reputational technique. However, several other sources of data were utilized in order to substantiate or repute the purely reputational aspects of the data. Data concerning social systems membership of influentials and systems considered important in the ongoing life of the communities were determined during the course of the study.

Selection of Judges and Nomination of Influentials

The methods employed in obtaining the respondents for this study were duplicated in each community to insure the comparability of the final data. The process used in arriving at the respondents to be interviewed was divided into two segments.

One of the authors and an Extension resource development agent contacted the county agricultural agent in each community. The agent was asked to recommend individuals whom he considered to be knowledgeable about the affairs of the community. The agent was asked to recommend individuals knowledgeable in one or more areas of community life such as politics or government, education, religion, agriculture, and business or industry. Six to nine persons were selected for interviewing from the list of nominees. These individuals were considered to be *judges*.

The *judges* were interviewed by one of the authors and the area resource development agent. They were asked to respond to questions concerning individuals whom they felt were important in causing things to happen, or keeping things from happening within the community.[5] The judges were also asked to identify organizations which they perceived as influential in accomplishing projects within the community.

Persons mentioned two or more times were selected for interviewing with a pre-tested schedule of questions.

Designation of Community Influentials

In the Riverview community, 23 individuals were nominated two or more times by the judges and 18 of the 23 were interviewed. In the Newtown community, 34 individuals were nominated two or more times by the panel of judges and 26 of the 34 were interviewed.

The criteria for selecting community influentials was based on the number of times they were mentioned as general community influentials by influentials, i.e., those nominated two or more times by the panel of judges. Thus knowledgeable individuals were designating persons whom they considered to be influential in community affairs. While many other individuals in the community make decisions of lesser import, it was felt that persons mentioned four or more times would represent the top decision-makers in the two communities.

Individuals receiving four or more mentions as having influence in the general community were designated as *reputed community influentials*. Persons who were interviewed but did not receive four mentions as having general community influence were designated *influential respondents*.

The Subsystem Analysis

The four subsystems used in this study were: 1) economic, 2) civic, 3) educational, and 4) governmental. These four subsystems were chosen based on the review of literature and on their probability for involvement in community decision-making. Below is a brief definition of each subsystem.

The economic subsystem included the business and financial complex of the community. It includ-

[4]Social structure is grounded in social interaction. It is the ordering and patterning of that interaction which is the structure.

[5]See Appendix D for the questions.

ed local industries, absentee-owned corporations, and national banks in the community.

The civic subsystem included the six major civic organizations located in the communities. These six organizations were: Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, Lions Club, Kiwanis Club, and Community Improvement Corporation or Development Council. These organizations were defined as civic because they have as their goal service to the community. These organizations were chosen because it was felt that they would play a more active role in community decision-making than organizations which were not conceived around this basic goal.[6]

The educational subsystem was represented by the superintendent of the local school system and by the school board, composed of community personnel who make policy decisions for the operation of the school.

The governmental subsystem included the mayor or city manager, the city council, and any ad hoc committees which might be important in the analysis of that subsystem. The analysis included the city government positions as they were more closely involved in community decision-making than the county government positions.

Background of Communities

This study attempts to analyze and compare the structure of influence in two rural communities in southern Ohio with population centers of less than 10,000 inhabitants. Background information reveals several similarities between the two counties of which the communities are a part.

The two communities are: the Newtown community located in Hickory County and the Riverview community located in River County.[7] Both Hickory and River counties have experienced a much slower rate of population increase than the entire state. Net migration in Hickory and River counties has been in the form of out-migration. The percentage of individuals 65 years of age and over indicates that the out-migration has taken place among the younger ages, as these two counties have a higher percentage of aged persons than the state average.

Both Hickory and River counties have a low median income, a high percentage of individuals living in rural areas, and more than 50 percent of their farmers making more money in off-farm employment than they make on the farm. This syndrome of factors reveals several problems which exist in these communities. Low income seems to be the result of large underemployment in agriculture. This underemployment is the result of a lack of alternative sources of employment in these communities. No industry in River County employs more than 75 people.

In Hickory County five manufacturing concerns employed more than 75 people. Two of these five industries were not located in the Newtown community. Two of the three industries in Newtown deal with the extraction and processing of mineral resources and the third industry is a food processing concern. These three major industries are incapable of absorbing the community's labor supply. An executive of one of the larger concerns stated that their files contained more than 200 applications for employment. Employment opportunities in both of these communities are not favorable.

Service facilities of a special type provide a large source of employment in River County. These service facilities are vital to the community as they serve as a major source of employment and purchase supplies from local merchants.

Factors such as the depressed economic conditions and the out-migration help explain the importance of specific sanctions and the composition of the reputed community influential population.

THE RIVERVIEW COMMUNITY

Reputed Influentials

Nine judges nominated 21 individuals two or more times and 18 of these persons were interviewed. Six of the 18 were mentioned four or more times in response to questions concerning general community influence. These six were designated *reputed community influentials* (Table 1). The respondents did not mention anyone else as having general community influence more than twice. The percentages indicate the number of times a reputed community influential was mentioned, in relation to the total possible mentions he could receive.

No list of names was given the respondent. Taking this into consideration, it would seem that a high degree of consensus existed among the respondents as

TABLE 1.—Six Reputed Community Influentials of Riverview and Number of Mentions Received as General Community Influentials.

Code No. of Influential	No. of Mentions Received	Percentage of Total Possible Mentions
2	13	72
4	10	56
7	8	44
8	10	56
9	4	22
11	8	44

[6]Only three of the six civic organizations were used. No reputed influentials were found to be members of either the Lions Club or the Kiwanis Club, and the age of the reputed influentials disqualified them from membership in the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

[7]Pseudonyms for the municipalities and the counties.

TABLE 2.—A Matrix of Riverview Reputed Community Influential Membership in the Business and Economic Subsystem of the Community.

	Financial Institutions*			Business Enterprises†		
Code No. of Influential	Citizens Bank	National Bank	Valley Bank	F-C Meat Co.	Bar-E Industries	Hilltop Board of Trustees (Hospital)
2	Board of Directors					Chairman of Board
4			Pres.	Board of Directors	Board of Directors	
7			Vice-Pres.			
8		Board of Directors				Board Member
9						Board Member
11				Pres.		Board Member

*Rand McNally International Bankers Directory. First 1965 Ed., p. 1534.
†Directory of Ohio Manufacturers, 1963. State of Ohio, Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics, p. 537.

to who affected general community decisions. Only one community influential received the minimum number of mentions, while three received more than 50 percent of the total possible mentions. These factors give support for the decision to consider only those individuals mentioned four or more times as general reputed community influentials.

Data on the influential respondents and their relationship to the reputed community influentials are presented in Appendix A.

The Business and Economic Subsystem

The matrix reveals that three of the six reputed community influentials hold positions of importance in the three banks in the Riverview community (Table 2). No. 4 also occupies important positions in two of the largest business enterprises in the community. Nos. 2 and 8 are both attorneys. No. 2 is chairman of the Republican party and No. 8 is chairman of the Democrat party. No. 7, in addition to being vice-president of the Valley Bank, is also a co-owner of one of the largest department stores in the community. Nos. 2, 8, 9, and 11 are all trustees of the Hilltop Hospital. The hospital as a business enterprise is of considerable importance to this communitty. It is the largest private employer in the community. No. 8, in addition to his law practice and financial interests, is the owner of a local radio station.

Each of these six reputed community influentials, with the exception of No. 11, holds positions which are not easily threatened by other status roles in the community. No. 11 was employed to fill the presidency of a processing plant. This position as an employed administrator makes No. 11 vulnerable to influence from No. 4.

The business enterprises are all locally owned and controlled. The only sizeable vertical subsystem in the community is a governmental facility and the administrative staff is not active in community affairs. The structure of this sybsystem lies entirely within the boundaries of the community.

From their formal positions, each one is able to derive influence both from that position and from various informal sources of influence, such as prestige of the family name. All of the influentials except No. 11 are second or third generation members of the community.

From this analysis, it can be stated that the six reputed community influentials hold positions from which they can exert considerable influence over the business and economic subsystems.

The Civic Organizational Subsystem

Of the six organizations involved in the civic organizational subsystem, reputed community influentials were eligible for membership in five. The age of the reputed influentials would disqualify them from membership in the Junior Chamber of Commerce. However, reputed community influentials held memberships in only three of the five organizations (Table 3). In general, the table reveals that reputed community influentials do not join civic organizations and that they attend only sporadically. However, two reputed influentials who are members of the Rotary Club had excellent attendance records, as did two of the five who belonged to the Chamber of Commerce.

When asked which organizations were most influential in the Riverview community, 10 of the 18 respondents named the Chamber of Commerce. However, five of the six reputed community influentials,

TABLE 3.—A Matrix of Riverview Reputed Community Influential Membership in Three Civic Organizations and Their Percent of Attendance in the Past 12 Months.

Code No. of Influential	Chamber of Commerce		Development Council		Rotary Club	
	Member or Officer	Percent Attendance	Member or Officer	Percent Attendance	Member or Officer	Percent Attendance
2	Member	0				
4						
7	Member	16			Member	100
8	Member	100				
9	Member	0	Member	0		
11	Member	95			Member	95

when asked this same question, said that no influential organizations existed in Riverview. Instead, they felt that a coalition of individuals "working behind the scenes" was responsible for accomplishing community projects.

Thus it seems that only one civic organization was important in the life of the community. This important organization had reputed community influentials as members. The fact that no organizations dominate community life seems to be evidenced by the fact that the Development Council and the City Planning Commission were ranked second and third, with six and three mentions respectively, by the 18 respondents when asked the question concerning influential organizations. While the influential respondents perceived the Chamber of Commerce as an influential organization, it must be remembered that the reputed influentials saw no organization as influential.

The role of the reputed community influentials in the civic organizational subsystem is probably best summarized by a statement from No. 4. When asked about organizations, he stated that he did not belong to any organizations, but that he could be more effective behind the scenes. He then related to the interviewer: "When something important comes up, I invite the key people involved out to my cabin in the country for dinner and some discussion."

The Educational Subsystem

The educational subsystem is linked to the larger sphere of community life by No. 11. He is president of the local school board. Through this position, he is able to exert his influence as a community leader. His background as a vocational agriculture teacher uniquely qualifies him for this position. He is the only reputed community influential with professional knowledge of school problems and how they may be solved.

In documenting his influence over educational matters in the Riverview community, three other factors are of relevance. First, in answer to the questions concerning influential individuals in educational matters, No. 11 received 13 of 18 possible mentions. This is unusual, as the superintendent of schools would normally be considered the most influential individual in school affairs. Second, the city superintendent was mentioned only four times as influential in educational matters. Two school board members (who were not interviewed) were each mentioned once and the County Superintendent of Schools was mentioned three times. Third, when the question concerning educational influence was posed to No. 11, he refused to name any individual. He did state that the superintendent was not influential in determining decisions about educational matters. From these three factors, it is reasonable to assume that No. 11 is the key influential in the educational subsystem.

The Governmental Subsystem

The lines of influence in governmental subsystems are indirect, but they exist and are real for persons involved in community government.

Riverview has had the city manager form of city government for 4 years. The city manager received two mentions as a reputed community influential. The city commissioners were only mentioned once. This situation would seem to eliminate these formal status roles as positions of major influence.

The city manager stated that all governmental leaders in the community talk to, in his words, "the top leaders" before they consider a final decision on important matters. While it was not learned whom he talked to, a historical example of reputed community influentials exerting their influence in the governmental subsystem will be presented.

The reputed community influentials who have been most concerned with local government are Nos. 2 and 8. No. 8 related the development of the city manager form of government in Riverview.

In a very matter of fact tone, he related how he

thought the city officials, through inept management of funds, had wasted local tax dollars. When the election came around the next year, he and No. 2 activated both political parties behind a referendum to change the structure of local government and to make it more amenable to public control.

This specific instance shows how other systems influence the governmental subsystem. This brief account reveals how reputed community influentials were able to use power, rank, and sentiment to invoke sanctions against positional leaders in the governmental subsystem. Such exercising of influence led several respondents to say that politics was the most important force in the Riverview community.

The city manager, as indicated by his description of the communication between himself and "top leaders," realizes that major power does not lie in his position. The reputed community influentials consciously recognize that they are the source of power in governmental affairs. A normative pattern of interaction appears to have developed between the positional leaders of the governmental subsystem and the reputed community influentials. The exact nature of this normative pattern would be difficult to discover. It does seem worthwhile to speculate about certain areas where this pattern would be activated.

The reputed community influentials are probably not interested in the day-to-day workings of community government. They become interested when local government is involved in such matters as committing facilities for industry or annexing land for industrial or housing developments.

Three of the six reputed community influentials stated that they wanted to see Riverview remain a residential community—for industrial sites to be located elsewhere. They felt that large scale industrial development would bring an unfavorable element into the community. These reputed community influentials would oppose industrial development, and they would exert their influence upon the governmental subsystem to insure that certain facilities would not be offered to industry. In short, this pattern of interaction between positional leaders and reputed community influentials is activated when the government is faced with a decision which would threaten the equilibrium of the communitty and ultimately the positions of these six men.

Summary of Findings

- Reputed community influentials were found to exert influence in four selected subsystems of the Riverview Community.
- The reputed community influentials were the source of this influence as no vertical systems were found to be active in the four subsystems.
- This influence was based on particular elements such as power—both formal and informal, rank, status-role position, sentiment, and sanctions.
- No vertical systems—extra-community based power—were active in the structure of influence within the community.
- Community influentials were not active in the day-to-day operation of the four subsystems. Instead, they seemed to become actively involved only when decisions were to be made which might threaten the equilibrium of the community.

The data presented indicate that reputationally defined community influentials were influential in the four selected subsystems of the Riverview community and thus the hypothesis can be accepted.

THE NEWTOWN COMMUNITY

Reputed Influentials

To insure comparability between the two communities, the same methodology was employed to delineate reputed community influentials. Thirty-four influentials were nominated two or more times by eight judges and 26 of the 34 were interviewed. Eight of the 26 influential respondents received four or more mentions as a general community influential, which was the criteria for selecting reputed community influentials. See Appendix B for data on influential respondents in the Newtown community.

In this analysis, only six of the eight reputed community influentials will be directly represented. One of the eight was ill during the interviews. Data concerning this individual were discovered during the course of interviews with other respondents. The other individual (individual C) who resides in a smaller community nearby was mentioned six times. C will not be included in the formal analysis, since he does not live in the community. Instead, he will be considered as a representative of a vertical system. Several factors seem to substantiate this decision.

C owns several industries throughout the area, including a brick plant located in the Newtown community. These industries and his other holdings place him beyond the local system of relationships. The influence which accrues to him seems more the result of his wealth than a direct desire to influence local community decisions. When C was interviewed, he made no direct mention of the Newtown community or of events taking place within its boundaries. Based on these factors, C will be dealt with only as the representative of the vertical system.

TABLE 4.—Six Reputed Community Influentials of Newtown and Number of Mentions Received as General Community Influentials.

Code No. of Influential	No. of Mentions Received	Percentage of Total Possible Mentions
5	5	20
8	11	42
14	4	15
16	4	15
21	15	58
25	6	23

The Business and Economic Subsystem

Two of the six reputed community influentials involved in this analysis, Nos. 5 and 16, are retired. No. 8 owns a wholesale and retail grocery business. No. 14 is the full-time mayor of Newtown and also owns a motel and a trailer court in the town. No. 21 owns 17 stores located in communities of between 1,500 and 10,000 inhabitants. No. 25 is president of the local bank.

An analysis of the business and economic subsystem will begin with the Newtown National Bank. No. 25 is president and Nos. 5 and 16 are directors of the bank. This would seem to represent a rather tight coalition of reputed community influentials holding secure status roles and having *control* of the major financial institution in the community. However, this does not represent the entire picture of the influence structure. One judge stated that the board of directors meetings were a "sham." He stated that the bank was both "owned and operated" by an individual who no longer resides in the Newtown community but was still extremely important in the busiess and economic life of the community. This individual (called A) owns the controlling block of stock in the bank and is also president of a plant which employs more than 100 persons and has the highest pay scale of any industry in the community. A is also president of a large insurance company and has various other financial holdings.

No. 25 has only recently ascended to the presidency of the bank. Prior to this promotion, the presidency was held by an individual (called B) who is now an administrative assistant to A. B is also vice-president of the plant of which A is president. No. 16, upon his retirement as an executive in the plant, was elected to its board of directors.

The analysis of the influence structure in the business and economic subsystem is difficult due to the complicated series of status-role sets. Individuals A and B must be considered components of vertical systems as they do not reside in Newtown and represent a larger system of interests beyond the local community. The relationship between A and B can be deduced from the fact that A employs B as an administrator. The relationship between A and B and the reputed community influentials is less direct and can best be dealt with in terms of the status-role relationships which exist among them. The bank president, No. 25, holds a status-role position more vulnerable to influence from A than Nos. 5 and 16, who are on the board of directors of the local bank.

Nos. 5 and 16 have both occupied positions vulnerable to the influence of A. No. 5 is now a member of the board of directors of the bank and before his retirement was an employee of the bank. These positions made him responsible to A, the major stockholder. No. 16, before his retirement, was an employee of the plant of which individual A is president. No. 16 is now on the board of directors of the plant. Both of these influentials are occupying and have occupied status-role positions vulnerable to the position of A. Based on these factors, it would seem that A occupies a position from which he could influence decisions made within the two largest components of the business and economic subsystems.

Besides A, two other vertical systems are important in the business and economic subsystem. The processing company has no management personnel directly involved in the influence structure of the community. The community realizes the importance of this company to the economic life of the community. In this respect, the company is able to influence the community when such acts are beneficial for the company.

No. 21 related how the local merchants raised $30,000 so the company might improve and enlarge its facilities. This represents the type of influence a vertical system can exert in order to secure decisions consistent with its desires.

This vertical system exerts influence through powerful economic sanctions. If the money had not been raised, the company could have completed payment of its lease contract and moved from the community. This would have left stockholders—many of them local merchants—with an unused building plus loss of income due to the unemployment of workers who purchase goods in their stores.

Another vertical system which impinges upon the local community is represented by C. Through his position as owner of the local brick company and various other industries, this individual is able to influence the community because he is what the local people call "our millionaire." His influence in the Newtown com.nunity can only be examined in terms of potential influence. No accounts of active influence were recorded during any of the interviews. However, his command of economic resources makes

him a potential source of influence in the community.

From this description of the business and economic subsystem, it would seem that these six reputed influentials are not the original sources of influence in this subsystem. Several factors seem to account for this. A maintains status-role positions which allow him to have at least formal influence over the three reputed community influentials associated with the local bank and the plant. It would also seem that certain other vertical systems hold potential influence which they utilize to effect decisions consistent with their desires.

Besides the vertical systems which exert influence over the local reputed community influentials, another more subtle feature of the influence structure might also account for the lack of direct influence by these reputed community influentials. Several of the respondents noted that the Newtown community was changing. The nature of this change was best described by No. 25. He stated that the wealth of the community is becoming more diversified. While historically the wealth of the community has been concentrated in the hands of a few individuals, this situation is changing. Economic diversification is suggested by the data in Appendix B, which reveals several independent status roles such as contractor, engineer, insurance agent, and veterinarian, all of whom were part of the population of respondents. This economic diversification has led to a broadening and diversifying of the influence structure, although a clearly defined new structure has not yet emerged. When the new structure does emerge, it will likely be composed of individuals occupying the new positions which have arisen through the Newtown community's redevelopment.

The Civic Organizational Subsystem

The civic organizational subsystem also seems to reveal the changing and broadening of the influence structure in the Newtown community.

Reputed community influential membership in six civic organizations reveals some interesting features about the structure of influence. The Rotary Club seems to be an important organization. Each of the reputed community influentials is either a member or has been an officer since 1962. None of them attend less than 66 percent of the meetings.

It seems that this organization would be most influential in the community as all the reputed community influentials are members. However, this was not the case. When the 26 respondents were asked to name the most influential organizations in the community, the Rotary Club received 12 mentions. The Chamber of Commerce, which has only one active reputed community influential as a member, received 11 mentions, only one less than the Rotary Club. The Junior Chamber of Commerce received 19 mentions as an organization which was influential in accomplishing community projects. None of the reputed community influentials were members of this organization, due to their age which would disqualify them from membership. This difference in the number of mentions received by these three organizations seems significant enough to warrant further examination.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce is composed of younger and more active individuals. These individuals have been active in attempting to attract industries to the community. One individual who is president of the Newtown Community Development Council is also active in the Junior Chamber of Commerce. This individual and the president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce have provided a core for the direction of local community projects.

The president of the local development council is the son-in-law of the reputed community influential who was not interviewed due to illness. This reputed community influential employs his son-in-law as an officer in the savings and loan company, of which he is president. This combination of kinship and status-

TABLE 5.—A Matrix of Newtown Reputed Community Influential Membership in Three Civic Organizations and Their Percent of Attendance in the Past 12 Months.

	Chamber of Commerce		Development Council		Rotary Club	
Code No. of Influential	Member or Officer	Percent Attendance	Member or Officer	Percent Attendance	Member or Officer	Percent Attendance
5	Member	0			Member	100
8	Member	0	Member	0	Officer	100
14	Member	0			Officer	100
16	Member	100			Member	100
21	Member	5			Member	66
25	Member	15			Officer	95

role relationships gives the reputed community influential a potential position from which he can exert influence over the activities of his son-in-law. Such a relationship gives meaning to a comment made by one judge concerning various local community projects. He stated that the "young blood moved ahead with the approval and money of the old blood." This statement characterizes the relationship between the predominantly older member and the younger member civic organizations in the community.

One of the six reputed community influentials, No. 25, is active in civic affairs through an ad hoc committee. This committee was organized by him to solve specific problems. No. 25 stated that he could contact a group of individuals at any time to assist him with a particular project. This group included influential respondents 2, 4, and 13. This ad hoc committee, according to No. 25, spent several evenings visiting employees of the Clay Brick Company in their homes. This was done to avert a threatened strike which would mar the community's trouble-free labor reputation.

This analysis has in part shown how the influence of the organizations composed of reputed community influentials is giving way to the younger, more active organizations. It is important to note that the respondents also reported this change. Evidence of this change is supported by the fact that an ad hoc committee has developed and that it was organized by the youngest of the six reputed community influentials. While this change is imminent, it has not been completed.

It was revealed that the reputed community influentials still hold positions in the Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club and that at least one reputed community influential holds a position from which he can exert influence in the organizations whose membership is younger adults. It seems that the reputed community influentials may hold at least partial influence in the civic organizational subsystem.

The Educational Subsystem

The educational subsystem of the community will be analyzed in terms of two different and distinct subsystems. One subsystem is composed of the local school officials and the board of education. The other subsystem is centered about the staff and the promoters of the Manpower Technical Training Center. Since these subsystems were separated in terms of administration and influence, they will be analyzed as distinct entities.

The educational subsystem seems to be formalized around the existing educational structure. Twenty-four of the 26 respondents mentioned influential respondent 6, the city superintendent of schools, when asked the question concerning influence in educational matters. Influential respondent 23, the president of the local school board, received six mentions as having influence in educational matters. One other board member received four mentions as having influence in the educational subsystem. This seems to reveal that the respondents equated formal position with influence in the educational subsystem or that the city superintendent actually was powerful.

Only one connection was discovered between the educational subsystem and the six reputed community influentials. One of the school board members who received only one mention as having influence in the educational subsystem is employed by No. 21. This linkage may only be of minor importance. When No. 21 was asked the question concerning influence in educational matters, he mentioned influential respondent 23. From this it would seem that either he did not consider his employee as an influential, or that he did not wish to reveal his linkage to the educational subsystem.

In view of this evidence, it would seem that the educational subsystem is able to operate independently of the reputed community influentials. While the one linkage between a reputed community influential and the educational subsystem seemed to be inactive, it still remains possible for No. 21 to exert influence through this linkage to affect decisions in this subsystem.

The establishment of a Manpower Technical Training Center for the Newtown community and the surrounding area was accomplished by an ad hoc committee. A committee was formed by No. 25 but was composed of different persons than the previous one, which attempted to stop a threatened strike.

The informal committee was organized in response to a need for technical training of local high school graduates. It had been determined that 75 percent of the high school graduates had taken college preparatory courses, yet only 25 percent received any education beyond high school.

The purpose of such a school was to train local young people for jobs and to supply future industry with technically competent personnel. This committee, composed of No. 25, influential respondent 24, and one additional community member attempted to obtain a federal grant to establish a Manpower Technical Training Center for the area.

This committee operated independently of the existing educational structure. It obtained facilities, financial support, and with the help of influential respondent 7 (the formal administrator), presented the entire program to a special meeting of the Chamber of Commerce. The center had actually been ap-

proved by the federal agency prior to this meeting.

Influential respondent 24 stated: "We wanted it and we got it! We were an informal committee and no one could fire us!" This statement is revealing in that each member occupied a secure status role within the community. Each member had a base of influence and certain facilities—money and acquaintances in public life—through which they could accomplish their goal without fear of sanctions from the community.

These distinct subsystems substantiate earlier statements about the structure of influence in this community. The educational subsystem operates independently of the reputed community influentials. While one reputed community influential occupies a position from which he could exert influence, no such actions were recorded during the interviews. This situation seems to indicate the decline of the reputed community influentials as a viable source of influence. Establishment of the training center was accomplished through an ad hoc committee. It was not the same committee which was organized to prevent the strike; however, No. 25 was a member of both committees.

These developments indicate the emergence of a new structure of influence composed of younger individuals who occupy or are beginning to occupy secure status-role positions. These two features of the influence structure seem to be prevalent in the three subsystems which have been examined.

The Governmental Subsystem

The governmental subsystem is closely linked to the reputed community influentials. Nos. 5 and 16 are both members of the city council and No. 14 is the mayor. This situation seems to represent a tight coalition of reputed community influentials in the governmental subsystem. Three of the six council members are employed at the plant and two of the three are on the executive committee of the plant. It would be possible for these two individuals—Nos. 9 and 16—to act as links between A and the local city government. This would give individual A linkage to an additional subsystem of the community.

While no evidence was recorded of A attempting to influence the decisions of the city council, this potential channel of influence must be considered in attempting to evaluate the decision-making process in this subsystem. Another vertical system which could potentially affect decisions within the governmental subsystem is represented by C. The son-in-law of C is a member of the City Council. This man is also the manager of the brick company owned by C. This relationship results in C having a position from which he could exert influence upon the City Council through his son-in-law.

While reputed community influentials are closely linked to this subsystem, it seems to be isolated from the more active decision-making elements of the community. A possible reason for this was provided by one respondent who stated that the City Council as a group was very conservative. This fact might be partially substantiated by the age of at least two of its members, both of whom are past retirement age. This conservatism could be the basic factor which separates this subsystem from the more active elements of community decision-making.

This set of factors creates a unique situation. The governmental subsystem is closely linked to reputed community influentials. Yet the influentials are vulnerable to influence from vertical systems, and they are isolated from the more active and seemingly influential ad hoc committees which are active in the Newtown community.

Summary of Findings

From this description of the influence structure in the Newtown community, several summary statements can be made concerning the relationship of the six reputed community influentials to this structure.

- The six reputed community influentials were either in positions vulnerable to influence from representatives of vertical systems, or they were not associated with the ad hoc committees which were active in accomplishing community projects. Thus the reputed influentials did not exclusively exert influence within the four selected subsystems of the Newtown community.
- Evidence was presented which supported statements concerning a change in the influence structure of the community.
- Important community projects seemed to be accomplished by a coalition of individuals which excluded all but one of the reputed community influentials.

On the basis of this analysis, the hypothesis must be rejected. The reputed community influentials were not the major source of influence in the four selected subsystems. They were either interaction links between vertical systems and the larger community, or they were isolated from the emerging groups which were active in accomplishing community projects. The influence of the emerging groups within the community clearly points to a broadening and diversifying of the influence structure.

The evidence also revealed that the individuals who were affecting community projects and decisions were not reputed community influentials. The ad hoc committees included one reputed community influential. This person, according to the data, did not

dominate these committees, even though his position as bank president would give him access to economic resources from which he could exert influence upon other committee members.

A COMPARISON OF THE RIVERVIEW AND NEWTOWN STRUCTURES OF INFLUENCE

The three primary elements—status role, power, and sanctions—are closely interrelated in both influence structures. The nature of the interrelationship among these elements and the specific types of elements found in the two structures were examined to determine if certain commonalities exist.

The elements and master processes to be considered are: 1) status roles, 2) power, 3) sanctions, 4) systemic linkage, and 5) boundary maintenance. By using these elements, which are common to all social systems, and then qualifying and specifying their existence within the structure of influence, it is possible to begin examining commonalities within the two structures of influence.

The element *power* was operationalized in this study as influence. This term was used to encompass all aspects of power which might accrue to the actors. Closely allied to the concept of power was the element *sanction,* which activates power and makes it meaningful to other actors in the system. It was also shown how influence revolved about certain status-role positions in the community. While influence coming from a status-role position is formal power, other factors such as coercion and voluntary influence could also be at work in affecting the actor or the decision. To insure that both these factors were included when discussing power acts or potential power acts, the more inclusive term *influence* was used.

Certain types of status-role positions, from which influence was exerted, existed in both communities. The status-role positions of these reputed community influentials were secure from those sanctions which accrue to formal status-role positions. The reputed influentials were, however, subject to the opinions and beliefs of their friends and colleagues. To the degree that they were influenced by these informal means, the reputed influentials did not act independently of the community system.

Such positions as those occupied by No. 4, the bank president, and No. 8, the lawyer, in Riverview epitomize positions which are secure from the formal sanctions of a particular status role. The reputed community influentials in Newtown were more vulnerable to influence from vertical systems than those in Riverview. Such positions as those held by individuals A, B, and C would more adequately represent the secure status-role position from which influence could be exerted upon subsystem members and positional leaders.

The type of influence exerted by these reputed community influentials or representatives of vertical systems seems also to have certain features of commonality. The reputed community influentials exercised influence only at times when their position, or the structure of relations in the community, could be altered. This situation was best expressed by the city manager—a positional leader—of the Riverview community. He stated that he contacted the "top leaders" only when an important decision had to be made within the governmental subsystems. No. 25 in Newtown community made a similar statement in referring to the ad hoc committee. The reputed community influentials exert influence only when decisions are to be made which might affect their position in the community. They do not attempt to affect day-to-day decisions, for they are not interested in them. These decisions are relegated to the positional leaders.

A common sanction described in this study has been the economic sanction. It was shown that the reputed community influentials in both communities were closely associated with the major financial institutions and business enterprises. Use of economic sanctions becomes doubly effective in an area where alternative sources of employment and facilities for borrowing money are practically non-existent. These sanctions, based on the status-role positions, are quite important. However, sanctions stemming from such informal aspects as family name and prestige must also be considered at work in influencing decisions.

The master processes involved in this comparison are combinations of the primary elements and processes. The two important master processes are *systemic linkage* and *boundary maintenance.*

These master processes are complementary. Systemic linkage deals with the integrative and interdependent features of the subsystems or systems, while boundary maintenance deals with the features which differentiate and distinguish systems or subsystems. In terms of comparison then, the two communities can be analyzed according to the distinctions based on these processes.

The four subsystems of the Riverview community were closely integrated through influence exerted upon them by reputed community influentials. As no vertical system with sizeable local resources impinged upon the influence structure of Riverview, it can be deduced that the boundaries are tightly maintained. A concrete example of how the boundaries are maintained was exhibited by the reputed community influentials who stated that they did not want industry to locate in Riverview. Industrial development might alter the structure of influence, making

the community subject to influence from sources beyond its sociological boundary.

In Riverview the influence structure was located entirely within the community and closely integrated the community. This situation defines the relationship between systemic linkage and boundary maintenance. When influence has its source within the community and when it closely integrates the community, then the boundaries of that community will be tightly maintained.

The Newtown community represents a different combination of these two master processes. The vulnerability of the reputed community influentials to influence from vertical systems, and their isolation from the more active ad hoc committees, revealed a changing influence structure. From this situation it would be logical to assume that reputed community influentials were not the primary decision-makers in the four subsystems. To the degree that these subsystems were operating autonomously, or based on influence from vertical systems, distinctions existed among the goals which these subsystems pursued.

The lack of systemic linkage seems to be a product of different sources of influence operating within the different subsystems and at different levels. This loose systemic linkage results in a lack of boundary maintenance.

Newtown represents a social system where the four selected subsystems were not closely integrated through influence exerted by the reputed community influentials. To the degree that the subsystems were not influenced by sources within the community, an opportunity existed for sources outside the community to exert influence. The sources of influence outside the community—vertical systems—can attain positions of influence with greater ease when the sociological boundaries are not tightly maintained. From this it can be concluded that as the sources of influence within the community decline, the boundaries are less tightly maintained and the possibility for vertical systems to exert influence increases. This type of a condition seems to exist in Newtown.

This analysis has attempted to determine if certain features of comparability could be found in two different influence structures. The comparisons were made by using three primary elements and two master processes which were defined by Loomis in his conceptual framework (16).

Through this analysis, specific types of elements were defined and shown to be comparable within the two communities. It was shown that influence was exerted on specific occasions. It was revealed how these elements are combined in a specific manner within two divergent types of influence structure, and that this combination of elements and processes was similar in each community. This reveals the commonality which exists in the exertion of influence. Such factors as these led the authors to hypothesize that the exertion of influence might operate independently of the structure of influence.

The relationship between boundary maintenance and systemic linkage revealed several factors which were not presented earlier. As the influence structure begins to undergo change, boundaries are less closely maintained, resulting in greater opportunities for vertical systems to exert influence within the social system. If this occurs, the new influence structure must compete with these vertical systems for influence over the community.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The influence structure represents the focal point of this analysis. The structure of influence in the Riverview and Newtown communities was found to be different in several respects, yet several features were common in both. In Riverview, the structure of influence was directed by the community influentials. Through their systemic linkage of the four subsystems, it was possible for them to maintain the sociological boundaries creating a closed system. In the Newtown community, the influence structure was changing. Two of the subsystems were vulnerable to decisions made by vertical systems, while ad hoc committees seemed influential in the remaining subsystems. However, in the Newtown community the reputed community influentials, with one exception, seemed neither to be the source of influence nor closely allied to influential units of the community.

Comments on the Reputational Method of Studying Community Power

This study attempted to examine the validity of the reputational method of identifying community influentials. The authors also utilized background data, historical situations, and other methods to substantiate or disprove the validity of the reputational technique. In the Riverview community, this technique proved very effective in defining the structure; it was less effective in delineating the influentials in the Newtown community.

The ability of the reputational approach to delineate influentials seems, at least in this study, to be closely aligned with the existence of vertical systems within the community. In the Riverview community, no vertical systems were active in the influence structure. The community represented a closed system of influence. Within this closed system, the composition of the reputed influential population was such that a reputation for influence had been established. Although much of the influence exerted by these reputed influentials was indirect or behind the

scenes, in such a closed system it soon becomes obvious who is exerting influence. In this manner a reputation for influence develops, making the conceptualization of power in this manner meaningful to the knowledgeable respondents.

Two factors which did not exist in the Riverview community seem to be crucial in explaining shortcomings of the reputational technique in delineating influentials in the Newtown community. These two factors are the existence of vertical systems and the emergence of new influentials.

The decision-making elements of the vertical system which were removed from local community were not delineated as completely as those elements of the vertical system located within the community. The status role of manager at the plant was identified as an influential respondent. Individuals A and B were also delineated but the actual relationship of these individuals to one another, to the bank, and to the plant were discovered through other methods. Both A and B were formerly members of Newtown.

Individual C was viewed as a vertical system within this study. However, his geographic proximity to the community, his wealth, and his manufacturing concern (located within the community) were sufficient factors to give him a reputation as an influential among the respondents. The ability of the reputational technique to identify these elements of vertical systems seems to lie with the location of the elements. It is able to identify only those elements which are geographically and socially near the community.

Another flaw of the reputational technique is revealed in the discussion of the processing company. In this instance the reputational approach was able to delineate the importance of the company as a vertical system. However, no status role appeared in the analysis due to the reputational approach's inability to discover one. This example even more clearly reveals the limitations of this technique in identifying geographically and socially removed decision-makers.

The emergence of new influentials creates a similar problem for the reputational technique. These emerging influentials were only partially delineated. Several members of the ad hoc committees who were working behind the scenes to complete certain projects were not identified.

The emergence of new influentials brings to light another problem of the reputational technique. A time lag seems to exist between the emergence of a new influential and the time he is reputed to be an influential. This time lag is a function of the time it takes a particular individual to develop a reputation for influence among the influential respondents and community knowledgeables who may serve as a panel of judges. This instance seems substantiated by the members of the ad hoc committees, several of whom seemed to be influential, but only one member was reputationally defined as an influential.

This time lag exists in both directions. Two of Newtown's reputed influentials—Nos. 8 and 21—no longer appeared to be active in the structure of influence, yet they received the highest number of mentions from the influential respondents. This reveals how a reputation for influence can exist after the actual involvement in decision-making has ceased. Elling and Lee (11) also make reference to this time lag: "The reputational technique probably has a built-in time lag because it is based on disseminated knowledge about positions and events."

This inability of the reputational technique to identify socially and geographically removed influentials and its inability to delineate emerging influentials represent serious shortcomings of this technique as a method of analysis. Conceptualizing of influence according to reputatiton should be bulwarked by social systems information and analysis of particular status roles in these systems. Such a broadening of techniques would be especially important in dynamic communities, plus those with several vertical systems employing or controlling sizeable resources in the local community.

A Comparison of Findings in Other Studies

The problem of comparability was examined in this study. The diversity of influence structures in the communities presented an interesting problem for comparing the two structures. If certain features of comparability could be found, it would then be possible to generalize to community influence structures lying somewhere between the static and the changing. The commonality of the two structures was discussed, using the general social system framework from which certain features of the elements were found to be common to both structures. The specific features common to both influence structures were the types of status roles and sanctions, and the occasions upon which either reputed community influentials or vertical systems exerted influence.

The relationships between a static and changing influence structure and systemic linkage and boundary maintenance were also found to provide methods for comparing communities. Further investigation of changing influence structures and their relationship to these concepts is needed before the real value of this comparative technique can be established.

Several generalizations based on past studies of large urban communities were set forth during a review of the literature. One of the purposes of this study was to examine the degree to which the general-

izations were applicable to small rural communities with population centers of less than 10,000 inhabitants. The three generalizations included the role of positional leaders, the integration between business and government leaders, and the type of individuals holding influence in the community.

Analysis of the data indicates that these generalizations would apply in both communities. However, certain distinctions need to be examined. Formal positional leaders in Riverview did not participate in decisions which would have community-wide repercussions. They did act as a communication channel between the reputed community influentials and the public. In Newtown, the formal leaders of the civic and the educational subsystems seemed to operate autonomously of the reputed community influentials. In the governmental subsystem, the mayor was a reputed community influential, as were two of the councilmen. From these positions, they could make decisions beyond the scope of the ordinary positional leader. The actual influence of the vertical systems would need to be more completely understood before this statement could be completely accepted.

In the Newtown community, it was shown that two of the reputed community influentials, while occupying positions in both the economic and the governmental subsystems, were (in terms of status-role positions) communication links between the subsystems and certain vertical systems. The economic and governmental subsystems of Riverview are systemically linked through the exertion of influence in each subsystem by reputed community influentials.

It was shown that in both communities the reputed community influentials occupied status roles secure from the influence of other positions within the community, i.e., not vulnerable in the same sense as a teacher or minister. These reputed influentials were either local businessmen or they were employed in professional occupations.

These generalizations then can, with certain distinctions, apply to small communities located in predominantly rural areas.

The conclusions reached from this study are:

- Using the reputational technique, it becomes difficult to locate and identify socially and geographically removed influentials. The time lag inherent in the reputational technique tends to overlook emerging influentials and to accept influentials who may no longer be active in community decision-making. However, the technique is able to delineate an active core of decision-makers. A modified reputational technique which employs certain other information to substantiate and amplify the purely reputational aspects of the data seems to reduce the shortcomings of this technique in studies of community power structures.
- The social system as a conceptual tool is useful as a theoretical framework from which to analyze the structure of influence. It also represents a general framework from which the researcher can make comparisons with other influence structures based on the specific manner in which the elements are used and combined.
- The vertical system concept was shown to be a useful tool in analyzing extra-community based influence which impinges upon the local community.
- The two small rural communities analyzed in this paper seem to exhibit characteristics similar to those of larger urban communities. This fact will allow future researchers to state, with greater confidence, propositions concerned with the structure of power at the community level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abramson, E. Feb. 1958. Social Power and Commitment: A Theoretical Statement. American Sociological Review, XXIII: 15-17.
2. Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Dept. of. 1960 Changes in Population and Agriculture in Ohio and Their Implications. Ohio Agri. Exp. Sta., Res. Circ. 104.
3. Bell, Wendell, Richard Hill, and Charles Wright. 1964. Public Leadership. Chandler Publishing Co., San Francisco.
4. Cooperative Extension Service, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, and The Ohio State University. 1964. Health Needs Met in Ohio by County.
5. Dahl, Robert A. June 1957. The Concept of Power. Behavioral Science, II: 202-203.
6. D'Antonio, et al. Dec. 1962. Further Notes on the Study of Community Power. American Sociological Review, XXVII: 848.
7. D'Antonio, William V., Howard J. Ehrlich, and Eugene C. Erickson. Oct. 1960. Reputation and Reality in the Study of Community Power. American Sociological Review, XXV: 637.
8. D'Antonio, William V. and Eugene Erickson. June 1962. The Reputational Technique as a Measure of Community Power. American Sociological Review, XXVII: 362-378.
9. Danzger, M. Herbert. Oct. 1964. Problems and Continuities in Power Structure. American Sociological Review, XXIX: 707-717.
10. Directory of Ohio Manufacturers, 1963. State of Ohio, Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics. The F. J. Heer Publishing Co., Columbus.

11. Elling, Ray H. and Ollie J. Lee. August 29, 1965. Formal Connections of Community Leadership to the Health System. Revision of paper presented at annual meeting, Society for Study of Social Problems, Chicago.
12. Emerson, Richard. Feb. 1962. Power Dependence Relations. American Sociological Review, XXVII: 31-41.
13. Form, William H. and William V. D'Antonio. Dec. 1959. Integration and Cleavage Among Community Influentials. American Sociological Review, XXIV: 804-815.
14. Freeman, Linton C., et al. Oct. 1963. Locating Leaders in Local Communities. American Sociological Review, XXVIII: 791-799.
15. Hunter, Floyd. 1953. Community Power Structure. Doubleday Anchor Books, New York.
16. Loomis, Charles P. 1960. Social Systems: Essays on Their Persistence and Change. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N. J.
17. Miller, Delbert C. Feb. 1958. Industry and Community Power Structure: A Comparative Study of an American and an English City. American Sociological Review, XXIII: 9-15.
18. Miller, S. M. 1963. Max Weber. Thomas Crowell Co., New York.
19. Mitchell, John B. August 26-29, 1965. Selected Characteristics of Influentials in Three Ohio Communities. Paper presented to Rural Sociological Society, Chicago.
20. Polsby, Nelson W. Dec. 1959. Three Problems in the Analysis of Community Power. American Sociological Review, XXIV: 796-803.
21. Powers, Ronald C. 1964. Identifying Community Power Structures. Unpublished paper, Iowa State University.
22. Presthus, Robert. 1964. Men at the Top. Oxford University Press, New York.
23. Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, First 1965 Ed. Rand McNally & Co., Chicago.
24. Schulze, Robert O. Feb. 1958. Economic Dominants in Community Power Structure. American Sociological Review, XXIII: 9.
25. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population 1960. General Population Characteristics, Ohio Final Report PC(1) 37-B. U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington.
26. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population 1960. General Social and Economic Characteristics. Ohio Final Report PC(1)37-C, U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington.
27. Warren, Roland. 1963. The Community in America. Rand McNally and Co., Chicago.
28. Weber, Max. 1961. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Transl. by A. M. Henderson and Talbot Parsons. Free Press of Glencoe Collier-McMillian Ltd., London.
29. Wolfinger, Raymond. Oct. 1960. Reputational and Reality in the Study of Community Power. American Sociological Review, XXV: 637.

APPENDIX A

Twelve Influential Respondents of Riverview, Their Status-Role Positions, and Number of Times Mentioned as Reputed Community Influentials.

Code No. of Influential	Status-Role Position	No. of Mentions Received as Reputed Community Influential
1	Restaurant owner	1
3	Lawyer—son of reputed influential 2	0
5	Retired—brother of reputed influential 4	2
6	Administrator of hospital where reputed influential 9 is chief of staff	2
10	City Commissioner—merchant	0
12	Retired—board of trustees of hospital where reputed influential 9 is chief of staff	2
13	President, Chamber of Commerce —Manager, Rural Electric Coop.	1
14	Lawyer—partner of reputed influential 8	0
15	City Manager	2
16	County Extension Agent	0
17	City Commissioner—optometrist	0
18	President, Development Council —printer	2

The 12 influential respondents who were not mentioned a sufficient number of times to be considered reputed community influentials are presented in the table above. Two types of information are presented: the status role held by the influential respondent and the number of times he was mentioned as a reputed community influential.

Several factors become evident from this table. None of the 12 influential respondents received more than two mentions as a reputed community influential. Respondents 3 and 5 have a kinship relation to two reputed community influentials. Respondents 6, 12, and 14 all hold positions which would necessitate a close relationship with two of the reputed community influentials. Respondents 10, 15, and 17 all hold positions which are vulnerable to public opinion. Status-role positions or kinship ties closely link five of the 12 influential respondents to the six reputed community influentials. Influential respondents 15 and 18 were the only respondents receiving two mentions as a general reputed community influential who were not closely related to the six reputed community influentials through status-role positions or kinship.

In contrast to the Riverview community where a tight linkage existed between the community influentials and the influential respondents, the Newtown community shows no close ties between the reputed community influentials and the influential respondents. The majority of the influential respondents hold status roles which are not easily affected by re-

puted community influentials. However, such positions as those occupied by the county extension agent, the city superintendent of schools, and the newspaper editor are all subject to public criticism and public opinion. The actions of these individuals are controlled to a greater extent by community members. The local community could more easily influence individuals in these positions than the positions held by reputed community influentials. The reputed community influentials occupy positions removed from dependent relationships with community members.

APPENDIX B

Eighteen Influential Respondents of Newtown, Their Status-Role Positions, and Number of Mentions Each Received as Reputed Community Influential.

Code No. of Influential	Status-Role Position	No. of Mentions Received as Reputed Community Influential
1	County Extension Agent, 4-H	0
2	Newspaper Publisher	1
3	Newspaper Editor	1
4	Furniture Store Owner	2
6	City Superintendent of Schools	1
7	Director, Manpower Training School	0
9	Executive, Iron Company	0
10	Contractor	1
11	County Extension Agent, Agriculture	0
12	Florist	0
13	Local Merchant	0
15	Officer, Local Savings and Loan	2
17	Homemaker—active in civic affairs	1
18	Foreman, Iron Company	0
19	Dentist	0
20	Homemaker—active in civic affairs	1
22	Contractor, Plumbing and Heating	1
23	Engineer—President of School Board	0
24	Insurance Agent	0
26	Veterinarian	0

APPENDIX C

Definition of Community
(Used with judges and influentials)

Riverview Community

Would you draw a line around the area which you consider to be the Riverview community? We would like you to include not only the incorporated limits of Riverview but also the area outside of the town where people feel they are a part of this community. For example, the area around Riverview from which people come to trade, buy most of their groceries and drugs, see the doctor, and buy appliances in Riverview.

A community is largely self-sufficient and the people share a common life.

APPENDIX D

Questions Asked Judges

Who are the people who can cause things to happen or can keep things from happening in this community? The people who are influential in community affairs.

What organizations, groups, or institutions are particularly significant (important) in the life of this community? They may be in areas such as education, religion, business, industry, government, and civic affairs.

The State Is the Campus for Agricultural Research and Development

Ohio's major soil types and climatic conditions are represented at the Research Center's 12 locations. Thus, Center scientists can make field tests under conditions similar to those encountered by Ohio farmers.

Research is conducted by 13 departments on 6482 acres at Center headquarters in Wooster, nine branches, Pomerene Forest Laboratory, and The Ohio State University.

Center Headquarters, Wooster, Wayne County: 1953 acres

Eastern Ohio Resource Development Center, Caldwell, Noble County: 2053 acres

Jackson Branch, Jackson, Jackson County: 344 acres

Mahoning County Farm, Canfield: 275 acres

Muck Crops Branch, Willard, Huron County: 15 acres

North Central Branch, Vickery, Erie County: 335 acres

Northwestern Branch, Hoytville, Wood County: 247 acres

Pomerene Forest Laboratory, Keene Township, Coshocton County: 227 acres

Southeastern Branch, Carpenter, Meigs County: 330 acres

Southern Branch, Ripley, Brown County: 275 acres

Western Branch, South Charleston, Clark County: 428 acres

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG 13 1971
on Adult Education